

DELEGATED OFFICER REPORT



WOKINGHAM
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Application Number:	242457
Site Address:	High View, Basingstoke Road, Spencers Wood, Wokingham, RG7 1AL
Expiry Date:	14 January 2025
Site Visit Date:	25 November 2024
Proposal: Householder application for the proposed erection of a two-storey front, side and rear extension and a single storey rear extension with changes to fenestration.	

PLANNING CONSTRAINTS/STATUS

Local Authorities
Green Routes and Riverside Paths
Affordable Housing Thresholds
Bat Roost Habitat Suitability
Borough Parishes
Scale and Location of Development Proposals
Great Crested Newt Consultation Zone
Ground Water Zones
Nuclear Consultation Zone
Borough Wards
Landscape Character Assessment Area
SSSI Impact Risk Zones
Thames Basin Heaths SPA Mitigation Zones
Green Routes and Riverside Paths Consultation Zone

PLANNING POLICY

National Policy	National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)
Core Strategy (CS)	CP1 – Sustainable Development CP3 – General Principles for Development
MDD Local Plan (MDD)	CC01 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development CC03 – Green Infrastructure, Trees and Landscaping CC07 – Parking TB21 – Landscape Character
Other	Borough Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document CIL Guidance + 123 List A Vision for Our Villages: Ryeish Green, Spencers Wood, Three Mile Cross

PLANNING HISTORY

Application No.	Description	Decision & Date
796/72	Double garage	Approved 11/05/72
1851/73	Extension of lounge and kitchen with two bedrooms	Approved 14/12/73
BR 13500	Porch	Approved 25/04/80
13303	Front porch	Approved 05/06/80

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

Internal

WBC Highways: No objection

WBC Landscape and Trees: No objection

WBC Ecology: Objection

External

None consulted

REPRESENTATIONS

Parish/Town Council	Shinfield Parish Council: No objection providing that it can be proven that vehicles are able to turn on the driveway allowing them to enter and egress in a forward gear. Officer response: WBC Highways raised no objection.
Ward Member(s)	No comments received
Neighbours	No comments received

APPRAISAL

Site Description: Two storey detached dwelling

Principle of Development: The National Planning Policy Framework has an underlying presumption in favour of sustainable development which is carried through to the local Development Plan. The Managing Development Delivery Local Plan Policy CC01 states that planning applications that accord with the policies in the Development Plan for Wokingham Borough will be approved without delay, unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The site is located within settlement limits and as such the development should be acceptable providing that it complies with the principles stated in the Core Strategy. Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy states that development must be appropriate in terms of its scale of activity, mass, layout, built form, height, materials and character to the area in which it is located and must be of high quality design without detriment

to the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers.

Character of the Area:

The R23 design principle within the Borough Design Guide states *“alterations or extensions should be clearly subservient to the form and scale of the original building in most situations, although there may be exceptions where it is more appropriate to design a seamless continuation”*. The first-floor element of the extension both to the side and rear is not entirely subservient to the existing dwelling as the proposal includes the creation of additional first floor habitable accommodation. The roof height of the side extension is not set down from the main dwelling’s ridge nor is the extension set back from the principal elevation. However, as the proposal is not overly excessive in size, height or built form and as the neighbouring properties in the surrounding area differ in size and appearance. The extension aims to provide a symmetrical property and reflect the existing design. It would appear at odds with the aesthetics of the principal elevation if the ridge of the side extension was reduced in height in order to comply with the design guidance. There will be no unacceptable harmful impact on street scene and character of the existing property.

The BDG states *“for properties in formal suburbia whether detached, semi-detached or short terraces, the rhythm of buildings and the gaps between them along the street frontage is often important to the character of the area. Side extensions should be set back from the building line by at least 1m, preferably with a lower roof line and should be at least 1m from the plot boundary”*. The proposed side extension would match the existing front building line. The property is set back from the road by over 10m, and approx. 1.14m from the plot boundary. Therefore, it is still considered to be a subservient addition which is suitable in scale and form which would not harm the character of the area.

It is noted that the development would notably reduce the space between the application dwelling and the adjacent property. When looking at the street scene, High View uncharacteristically has a large opening to the side of the property whereas dwellings in close proximity are built closer to the side boundary. The form and scale of the proposed extension would not be dissimilar or out of character with other features within the nearby area, and the loss of this gap would not be detrimental to the character of the street scene. The proposal has still maintained a separation distance over 1m between the neighbouring property (The Beeches) and extension, thus preventing any terracing concerns.

R23 of the Borough Design Guide requires rear extensions to be limited to 4m in depth and extensions to be stepped down from the main ridge. It also seeks to achieve a coherent and well-designed approach that influences and responds to the original building. Whilst the rear extension would be approx. 4.05m and the proposed roof form would not be considered to be coherent and well-designed approach that influences and responds to the original building. However, this would be largely indiscernible and not visible from the public domain. Hence, it would not have an adverse impact on the character of the host property or surrounding area.

The proposal would alter the current street scene and slightly alter the characteristics of the street. However, the new windows would be similar to the existing in size and

proportions of current ground floor windows of the property meaning that the proposal would not negatively harm the street scene. The proposal meets the recommendations of the Borough Design Guide and is line with policy CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy.

The existing boundary treatment of Laurel Heding will be replaced by close boarded fencing along the boundary with The Beeches, such alteration would not harm the street scene given fencing is common side boundary treatment along Basingstoke Road and would not look out of place. Furthermore, along this boundary, fencing was in place as shown by the Google Maps photo in 2019.



The proposed materials would be similar to the existing, therefore in keeping with the current characteristics of the dwelling and would not harm the street scene. Furthermore, within the street scene there is no set material palette.

Neighbouring Amenity:

Overlooking: The scheme would add 2 windows at the front of the property as part of the side extension. Whilst the proposed window would face another property, it is noted that Basingstoke Road, a public road, is located adjacent to the site. As such, the proposal would not result in a greater overlooking impact into residential properties than is currently present as the window at the front of the extension would overlook the street scene and therefore no harmful impact would occur.

The ground floor windows on the side elevation facing The Beeches will be screened by the existing fence, thus preventing overlooking.

The ensuite bathrooms on the first-floor side elevation are non-habitable rooms therefore there are no overlooking concerns in relation to these windows.

The ground floor window and bi-folding door in the rear elevation for the kitchen/dinning area would overlook onto the is existing ancillary accommodation, thus no harmful overlooking.

The first-floor home office and Juliet balconies would not result in harmful overlooking as they would overlook the rear garden of the property where there is existing ancillary accommodation and the nearest property is 30m away.

Loss of Light: The proposal will not result in harmful loss of light given as the first-floor

rear element does not extend across the entire width of the dwelling, with a 3.15m opening. Therefore, given the opening left and separation distance between the dwelling and The Beeches the proposal would not result in harmful loss of light.

Overbearing: The extension is considered appropriate in the context of the plot and the size of the dwelling would be proportionate to its plot with adequate breathing space to side boundaries and neighbouring properties. The height of the dwelling will not change and the extensions are not considered to have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property.

Amenity Space: The property benefits from a large plot and the extensions do not materially impact the usability of the garden. The garden remains of an acceptable size following the extensions

Highway Access and Parking Provision: The proposal will result in additional habitable rooms. The existing level of parking (and turning) will be retained as shown on the parking plan, and this meets WBC parking standards. No objection has been received from the Highways Officer.

Landscape and Trees: The site is on a Green Route featuring houses setback within their plots, of various ages and design styles. Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 578/1993, T3, a sycamore grows near the south entrance of the site. A yew tree and hedges bound the front of the plot.

The TPO tree is not of a size and therefore proximity such that it will be unduly harmed by the works. The application form states that a laurel hedge will be pruned, the landscape officer takes that to be the rear south side boundary hedge. The yew and front boundary hedges will also stay, according to the application. They offer public green amenity to the Green Route; their retention helps the scheme to accord with policies such as CC03 and CP3.

Ecology: A preliminary roost assessment dated October 2024 by John Wennman Ecological Consultancy has been submitted with the application. This concludes that bats are present and further survey work is required to understand the status of the roosts.

The aim of the PRA is to determine the actual or potential presence of bats in the property and whether further survey and/or mitigation would be required for future proposed development activities. The further survey recommended to characterise the roost, and to establish the presence or absence of other bat roosts in the property, to be able to assess fully whether the development proposals will have an adverse effect on bats and design a mitigation strategy must be submitted prior to determination. As further bat surveys and mitigation proposals have not been submitted, a lack of ecological information and failure to comply with policies CP03, CP07, CP1, CP3 and CP7 shall be included in reasons for refusal.

Protected species are a material consideration and the presence/absence of a species and the implications of the proposal on protected species must be considered at the point of determination. It is not possible to condition these surveys as part of granting permission.

Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL):

When planning permission is granted for a development that is CIL liable, the Council will issue a liability notice as soon as practicable after the day on which the planning permission first permits development. Completing the assumption of liability notice is a statutory requirement to be completed for all CIL liable applications.

This development will be liable for CIL based on the measurements taken from the following drawings:

2417-P100

2417-P101

Net increase in floorspace is approximately 125sqm.

The Public Sector Equality Duty (Equality Act 2010): In determining this application the Council is required to have due regard to its obligations under the Equality Act 2010. The key equalities protected characteristics include age, disability, gender, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief. There is no indication or evidence (including from consultation on the application) that persons with protected characteristics as identified by the Act have or will have different needs, experiences, issues and priorities in relation to this particular planning application and there would be no significant adverse impacts as a result of the development.

RECOMMENDATION

Conditions agreed:	Not required
Recommendation:	Refused
Date:	13 January 2025
Earliest date for decision:	10 December 2024

Recommendation agreed by: (Authorised Officer)	
Date:	14 January 2025